

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

February 29, 2000 LB 1107

you don't believe that, just try passing tax incentive programs for businesses and then trying to change the provision in those. It's very, very hard to do. So all I'm suggesting is that you need to take a long view, you need to make sure that what you do is sustainable, and then carry it out as part of an integrated program. . And really I think the suggestion here or the...what that suggests to me on this bill is that we set the percentages and the deviation of minimum levy penalty in such a manner that the one dollar levy lid will stay in place for a year or two before there is any additional change made. I would disagree with Senator Chambers, I do support this bill. I think it is a good idea to explicitly put these sorts of things in statute and indicate with intent and otherwise that this is an issue of concern. I just hope that it is done in such a way that it is systematic and sustainable. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Chambers. This will be your third time also, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, there are numerous issues that come to play in a bill such as this. I was just consulting with my financial advisor, "Deacon" Jones, and pointing out an additional difficulty I have with the bill based on people who have ag land wanting that land valued on the basis of its ability to produce income rather than fair market value. I told him that I'm aware that people come into some parts of the state and pay a premium price for land. And if that type of purchasing raises the fair market value, 45 percent of that higher value, based on fair market value, would produce more dollars than 45 percent of that land valued at its income-producing capability, which may be considerably lower. So let's say that the ag interests succeed in having land valued on the basis of income production, not fair market value. Well, if they sell that land, they're going to get fair market value, which is up here. If they hold it, they're going to pay taxes down here. If you pay at the income-producing level, the 45 percent of that which is the maximum that can go into the aid, it's going to be fewer dollars paid by that area and more state dollars that have to come in, even though the fair market value of that land is considerably higher, and people in urban areas are not going to get the same break. So it is a rural-urban issue. And rather than put into